P94

THE

MERIT PROMOTION

GUIDEBOOK

NEWARK PUBLIC LIBRARY

SEP 10 1986

U. S. GOVT. PUBS.
DEPOSITORY 326

Midwest Region
1986

T22.19/2:

Table of Contents

Introduction..... Page 1

References..... Page 2

Key Terms..... Page 3

Responsibilities of the Manager..... Page 5

Determining Evaluation Criteria..... Page 6
- Bargaining Unit..... Page 6
- Non-Bargaining Unit..... Page 6
- Management Careers Program..... Page 6

Determining Highly- and Best-Qualified Candidates..... Page 7
- Bargaining Unit..... Page 7
- Non-Bargaining Unit..... Page 10
- Management Careers Program..... Page 11

General Guidance on Ranking..... Page 12

Meaningful Distinctions..... Page 13

Roster of Eligibles for Promotion and Promotion Certificate..... Page 14

The Use of Tests..... Page 15

Interviews..... Page 16

Appraisals of Potential and Employee Questionnaires..... Page 18

The Selection..... Page 19

Index of Exhibits

Bargaining Unit Conversion Table..... 1

Charts for Part B Scores..... 2, 3, 4, 5

Form 4537, Roster of Eligibles for Promotion and Promotion Certificate..... 6

READEX

INTRODUCTION

Serving as a ranking official or as a ranking panel member is not an easy task. The ranking process is extremely critical to all involved because decisions are made which affect the lives and careers of many employees.

Ranking officials/panels must ensure that they are fair and consistent throughout this process. There are a variety of regulations and procedures to be followed. What we would like to do with this guidebook is make this process more comfortable for you. We also hope to achieve a consistent understanding among panel members to ensure that we certify the best possible candidates to selecting officials.

There are several sets of regulations/procedures to be followed depending on the type of position being filled (i.e., bargaining unit, non-bargaining unit, management careers program). We will outline each of these procedures for you, as well as provide you with guidance on how to administer them.

REFERENCES

FPM 335	Promotion and Internal Placement
FPM Supplement 335-1	Evaluation of Employees for Promotion and Internal Placement
IRM 0335.1	Management Careers Program for Selection and Development of Managerial Personnel
IRM 0335.2	Service-wide Promotion Plan
IRM 0335.3	Nation-wide Placement Program
IRM 0335.5	Use of Tests in In-Service Selection
Training Document 9836-03	The Rater's Guide to KSA-Based Job Analysis

National Agreement between IRS and NTEU:
National Office, Regions, and Districts (NORD)
Article 13 - Promotions/Other Competitive Actions

Service Centers, Detroit Data Center, and National Computer Center (NCA)
Article 13 - Promotions/Other Competitive Actions

KEY TERMS

Application for Promotion/Reassignment, Form 4536 - form used by employees to indicate interest in promotion, demotion, or reassignment to a particular position.

Bargaining Unit Position - position in a unit for which a union has been certified as exclusive representative.

Best-Qualified Candidates - highly-qualified candidates who rank at the top when compared with other highly-qualified candidates and who are referred to the selecting official for consideration and selection.

Eligible Candidates - those applicants who meet the qualification standards for the vacancy, and other regulatory requirements such as time-in-grade, as well as applicable selective placement factors, by the closing date of the announcement or date specified in the announcement.

Evaluation Criteria - standards of job-related knowledges, skills, abilities, and other personal characteristics (KSAO's) which are indicative of highly successful performance in the position to be filled. Criteria are used as standards against which eligible candidates are compared and ranked for determining highly- and/or best-qualified.

Evaluation Methods - the means of measuring a candidate against the evaluation criteria. Mandatory methods which must be considered for all candidates are performance appraisals and pertinent incentive awards. Other optional methods frequently used are interviews and pertinent training.

Highly-Qualified Candidates - eligible candidates who have been determined to possess the knowledges, skills, abilities, and other personal characteristics (KSAO's) described by the evaluation criteria as necessary to perform the position applied for in a highly successful manner.

Promotion - change of an employee to a position at a higher grade.

Qualification Standards - a description of the knowledges, skills, abilities, and other personal characteristics (KSAO's) needed to meet basic eligibility requirements contained in IRM 0338 or FPM X-118.

Ranking Official or Panel - person or persons charged with the responsibility of determining the highly- and best-qualified candidates as described by the evaluation criteria.

Selecting Official - manager delegated authority to make a selection.

Selective Placement Factors - knowledges, skills, abilities, and other personal characteristics (KSAO's) that go beyond minimum qualification standards, but may also be prescribed as necessary for meeting basic eligibility. These factors must be essential to successful performance in the position to be filled and cannot be readily attainable after promotion (generally 3 to 6 months).

RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE MANAGER

Your basic responsibilities are outlined below. Throughout this booklet we will expand on many of these areas.

Complying with the spirit, as well as the procedural requirements, of the promotion plan and related negotiated agreements.

Evaluating subordinates fairly, objectively, and in a timely manner.

Counseling employees on annual evaluations, as well as those which may be completed for use in a promotion action.

Developing job-related evaluation criteria and determining appropriate evaluative methods, in conjunction with personnel, prior to ranking.

Offering constructive criticism of the provisions and operations of the promotion plan together with suggestions for improvements.

Ensuring that all subordinate employees have access to promotion plan procedures and are fully informed of promotional opportunities.

Providing meaningful counseling and feedback to employees who were not selected.

Working with employees to identify areas of improvement to enhance their promotion potential.

DETERMINING EVALUATIVE CRITERIA

Bargaining Unit Positions - With the implementation of NORD II and NCA II, the method for filling vacancies significantly changed. We now use the critical elements of the position being filled (except for GS-7 and below and wage board positions at the service center) as the criteria for determining highly-qualified candidates.

Non-Bargaining Unit Positions - The selecting official (or subject matter expert), in conjunction with personnel, must develop job-related criteria for determining highly-qualified candidates. During this process the job-related knowledges, skills, abilities, and other personal characteristics (KSAO's) which are indicative of highly successful performance in the vacant position are outlined. Evaluation criteria must be established and documented prior to the beginning of the competitive ranking process. Good sources of information about the job include: 1) qualification standard; 2) position description; 3) classification standard; and 4) organizational chart. It is also important to determine at what level these job-related criteria are required for successful and highly successful job performance.

Evaluative methods which will effectively measure the stated criteria must also be identified. A variety of methods are usually available for this phase. These methods include appraisals of performance and/or potential, application forms, relevant training and awards, self-assessments, interviews, employee questionnaires, employee performance files, and official personnel folders.

Criteria must be measurable. They may be weighted or unweighted, and carefully take into consideration the relative importance of each in the performance of the job being filled. You must also ensure that this process is thoroughly documented so that any third party who conducts a review of the promotion package can understand why you chose the specified KSAO's. Your personnel staff will work closely with you throughout this process to ensure conformance with the various governing regulations.

Management Careers Program Positions - There are standard forms and criteria for determining highly-qualified candidates for positions covered by this program. Ranking panels must use Form 6567, Management Careers Program Panel Rating Form, which outlines these standard criteria. It may be necessary to develop additional criteria for determining best-qualified candidates. If this is necessary, the methods described above for non-bargaining unit positions should be followed.

DETERMINING HIGHLY- AND BEST-QUALIFIED CANDIDATES

In the previous section, we discussed the methods to be used for developing criteria. During this process you will be applying the appropriate criteria to each candidate to determine his/her potential for the vacant position. You should remember several key items/issues before you begin. They are outlined below:

Conduct the ranking in a fair and equitable manner, ensuring that non-merit factors are not considered.

Base your ranking upon objective consideration of the facts, not upon subjective or personal considerations. Your personal knowledge of an applicant's abilities, however, may be considered in the process.

Be consistent and uniform in your application of the ranking criteria.

Justify each rating with a narrative statement.

Ensure the confidentiality of the process and the privacy rights of each candidate.

Take your role seriously, remembering that your deliberations mean a great deal to the career of each candidate you will rank.

Be confident and thorough in your final product, since there is always the chance that the promotion package may be reviewed by a third party.

Bargaining Unit Positions

The highly-qualified criteria for bargaining unit positions are the critical elements of the vacant position. You should review Article 13 in the agreement before you begin. You will then prepare a conversion table form for each eligible candidate which will give the candidate credit for his/her appraisal, and provide for your assessment of the individual's potential to perform the duties of the vacant position.

Part A of the form is completed by extracting the employee's ratings on the critical elements of the current position from the appraisal, and recording them in the spaces indicated on the form. You will then total the ratings and divide by the number of critical elements to arrive at an average rating. The average rating is then multiplied by 5 or 6 depending on the grade level of the position being filled. Do not use the rating on elements not designated as critical. Also, if a critical element is not rated, it should not be included when arriving at the average rating.

Note: If a PMRS employee applies for a bargaining unit position, a Form 3861, Performance Appraisal, must be prepared (in addition to the annual PMRS appraisal) and used to arrive at the Part A score. The ratings on the 12 General Factors are used in place of critical elements.

Part B of the form is where you (or the panel) come in. In this section, you must make judgments about the employee's potential to successfully perform in the vacant position. When determining potential to perform the critical elements of the vacant position, each member of the panel individually rates the applicant against each critical element. (Exhibit 1 provides a sample completed conversion table form.)

When making determinations of potential, you should carefully review all evaluative methods listed on the vacancy announcement. In addition to reviewing the performance appraisal, you may be looking at pertinent experience, job-related education, appraisals of potential, and/or employee questionnaires.

The ranking official/panel will determine the score to be assigned to each applicant. A score will be assigned for each critical element of the vacant position as follows:

Rating Level 5: Excellent Potential - The candidate is now able to perform at a level which is above fully successful on this critical element.

Rating Level 4: Substantial Potential - The candidate is now able to perform at a level which is fully successful on this critical element.

Rating Level 3: Good Potential - The candidate can be expected to perform at a level which is fully successful on this critical element after minimal developmental training and/or experience.

Rating Level 2: Moderate Potential - The candidate can be expected to perform at a level which is fully successful on this critical element only after considerable developmental training and/or experience.

Rating Level 1: Limited Potential - The candidate can be expected to perform at a level which is fully successful on this critical element only after extensive additional developmental training and/or experience.

Note: There is no specific guidance on the definitions or application of the terms minimal, considerable, and extensive used to describe/differentiate between the rating levels. The ranking official/panel, having full knowledge of what is required for the position, must apply judgment in the application of the rating levels. The key is that all candidates are treated consistently.

Also, there has been some concern that if the critical elements of a vacant position are similar or identical to the applicant's current elements, the rating of potential could not differ from the performance rating. This is not true. While the elements may be the same, the job, because of the higher grade level, is more difficult. Therefore, while someone may be rated a 5 on his/her performance appraisal (outstanding - exceeds all performance aspects of the standard), the rating of potential may very well be a 4 (substantial potential). Rating level 5 requires that the candidate is now able to perform at a level which is above fully successful. This would mean, for example, that a GS-11 revenue agent applying for a GS-12 revenue agent can move to the GS-12 position and immediately perform the critical element in an above fully successful manner. If this is true in the judgment of the official/panel then a 5 rating of potential would be warranted.

The Part B score is arrived at by totaling the scores of potential assigned to each critical element, dividing the total by the number of critical elements, and multiplying the results by 4 or 5 depending on the grade level of the position being filled. Exhibits 2, 3, 4, and 5 are charts that perform these calculations for you. Instructions for use are contained on each chart.

Article 13 of the service center agreement (NCA) provides specific procedures for filling GS-7 and below and wage board vacancies. Since they are outlined in detail in the agreement, they will not be restated in this guidebook.

Part C of the form provides for the crediting of pertinent awards. For positions covered by the NORD agreement, you must add 1 point (up to a maximum of 3 points) for each high-quality step increase, sustained superior performance award, or performance-related special act award (where cash was granted) received by the applicant in the last 3 years.

For positions covered by the NCA agreement, the ranking official/panel will award ranking points (up to a maximum of 5) for each incentive award, including high-quality step increases, received by the employee within 3 years prior to the closing date of the announcement as detailed below:

a) 2 points for each high-quality step increase.
b) 2 points for each sustained superior performance award.
c) 2 points for each suggestion award of $150 or more.
d) 1 point for each other suggestion award.
e) 1 point for each special act award (where cash was granted) that is performance related (total points awarded not to exceed 3 points).
f) 1 point for each accepted system change.

Part D of the form is provided to record the part totals and the total score assigned to the applicant. Please be sure to sign the form in the space indicated.

Calculate all scores to the nearest two decimal places.

The ranking official/panel is required to prepare one written narrative statement for each applicant and each critical element. Each narrative statement must reflect the judgment of the applicant's ability to perform the critical element of the position for which he/she is being considered. This narrative statement should contain complete and detailed information on how you arrived at or assigned a point value for each of the elements. Merely assigning a score, followed by a statement such as, "I/We have reviewed the 6850, training, EPF, etc., and assigned a rating of 3" is not appropriate or acceptable. The new potential definitions really force the official/panel to take a close look at what the applicant has to offer, and not just roll over the appraisal scores as indicators of potential. Many personnel offices have developed a standard format for the narrative justifications to achieve consistency among panel members, and will provide it to you if available.

The ranking official/panel should establish a highly-qualified cut-off score prior to ranking. Generally, the highly-qualified cut-off score should remain consistent for like vacancies. The four candidates who rank at the top will be designated as best-qualified. The selecting official will receive four candidates on the best-qualified list plus one additional candidate for each additional vacancy. Up to ten candidates may be certified for one vacancy if there are tied scores. If more than ten candidates have tied scores, IRS length of service will control. If more than 4 candidates are certified as best-qualified because there are multiple vacancies, and the decision is made that all of the positions will not be filled from the subject promotion certificate, the number of best-qualified candidates must be adjusted downward prior to making a selection.

NOTE: NCA Only - The HQ cut-off score must not exclude those in the top 50% of the group.

Non-Bargaining Unit

Using the criteria and rating plan that you developed, you must now make judgments as to how the applicant's credentials compare to the KSAO's. All methods outlined in the vacancy announcement must be reviewed. When using a crediting plan, which is the preferred method, scores on the criteria must be combined to form an overall promotion score which should be indicative of the candidate's potential to perform the duties of the vacant position in a highly successful manner.

The way the evaluation procedures were followed by the ranking official/panel, the way the information from the methods was interpreted and used, and the procedure for combining the results of the individual criterion rating to arrive at the total score for each candidate should be stated as precisely as possible.

If the number of highly-qualified candidates is five or less, all of them may be certified as best-qualified. If the number of highly-qualified exceeds five, generally the best-qualified will be the three to five candidates who rank at the top when all the highly-qualified candidates are compared. Up to ten candidates may be certified if meaningful distinctions cannot be made among a smaller number of highly-qualified candidates.

Management Careers Program Positions

Form 6567, Management Careers Program Panel Rating Form, must be used for determining highly-qualified candidates. This form outlines six standard criteria and provides for documentation of assigned ratings. To assist in making highly-qualified determinations, panels will use the appropriate evaluation form, (Form 6477, PMRS Appraisal, Form 3861, Performance Appraisal, or Form 6850, Job Elements Appraisal), Form 6568, Report of Managerial Potential, and Form 5459, Managerial and Executive Placement Questionnaire, (provides information on experience, education, training, awards, and a statement of accomplishments). The scores assigned are totaled, and the candidate must have, at a minimum, 21 points to be considered highly-qualified.

In determining best-qualified, the following options are available: 1) you may use the points assigned during the highly-qualified process, set a higher cut-off score, and certify candidates at or above the cut-off score as best-qualified; 2) establish new, more specific criteria and rank the highly-qualified candidates; 3) if there are five or fewer highly-qualified, all may be certified as best-qualified.

GENERAL GUIDANCE ON RANKING

A major problem that sometimes surfaces is the ranking official's/panel's over-reliance on the performance appraisal. Unfortunately, several inconsistencies exist in the performance appraisal system. First, not all managers assign or interpret the numerical scores of performance in the same manner. Second, one manager may provide more detailed documentation to substantiate a particular rating, while another manager may give the same rating without very specific documentation.

You should ensure consistency in the application of the criteria. Remember that when reviewing a candidate's prior experience, over-reliance on the "job title" alone will not give you an accurate assessment of the individual's potential. You should, instead, be looking at a number of variables related to a particular job. These include: actual duties performed; level of responsibility involved; quality of work performed; special projects and assignments; and difficulty of cases/work handled. It is more appropriate to focus on a person's accomplishments in relationship to the KSAO's or critical elements of the vacancy rather than his/her work or educational experience per se.

The use of a ranking official or panel is mandatory for identifying highly- and best-qualified candidates. Panels should be used for professional and technical occupations. An official should be used for clerical or para-professional positions. Ranking officials and panel members should be at or above the grade level of the position being filled. For bargaining unit positions, the immediate supervisor of an applicant may not serve as a ranking official, but may serve as a panel member.

MEANINGFUL DISTINCTIONS

A meaningful distinction is generally defined as a significant difference from the remainder of the group. For example, a group of highly-qualified candidates received the following scores:

Washington -	90	Monroe -	75
Adams -	88	Jackson -	73
Jefferson -	86	Van Buren -	71
Madison -	85	Lincoln -	70

The logical break or meaningful distinction would be between scores 85 and 75. Therefore, the best-qualified would be those candidates with scores 85 and above.

ROSTER OF ELIGIBLES FOR PROMOTION AND PROMOTION CERTIFICATE

Exhibit 6 contains a completed Form 4537, Roster of Eligibles for Promotion and Promotion Certificate.

Personnel will complete the front page of this form. After you have completed the ranking and have determined the highly-qualified candidates, you should place an asterisk (*) before the name of each highly-qualified candidate.

After a best-qualified determination has been made, list them in alphabetical order, without scores, on part II of Form 4537. The ranking official/panel should then sign the certificate and have it reviewed by personnel prior to submitting the candidates to the selecting official.

Once a selection is decided upon, the selectee(s) name(s) should be recorded in the space provided. The selecting official must than sign and date the certificate.

THE USE OF TESTS

The purpose of testing is to measure critical skills needed for the position being filled. Few positions now require that applicants take a test.

For certain positions, usually non-bargaining unit, the test score and evaluation are combined to determine the highly-qualified candidates. The procedures for this process are outlined in the exhibits to IRM 0335. Since the use of tests is infrequent, this process will not be discussed in detail in this guidebook. Your personnel specialist will ensure that you are fully briefed on this process should the need arise. It may be necessary for you to develop criteria, using the KSAO process, to determine the best-qualified candidates.

INTERVIEWS

The interview process is useful as one of the methods for identifying the best person for the job. Interviews are especially important when evaluating candidates for positions involving interpersonal effectiveness, public contact, or managerial positions.

An interview may be used in conjunction with rating an applicant's potential, or you may choose to interview only the candidates who will be referred to the selecting official. The selecting official may also choose to conduct interviews of the best-qualified candidates. When using an interview as part of the ranking process for a bargaining unit vacancy, any general questions used must be recorded and kept in the file. This is a requirement of both NORD and NCA agreements. It should not, however, be construed as requiring the panel to ask identical questions of each applicant.

The type of information obtained during an interview may greatly differ among candidates. This will usually happen when an unstructured interview approach is used. Therefore, it is important that you carefully plan what you want to achieve or measure with the interview. It is best to establish a set of standard questions that should be presented to each interviewee. This will ensure that each candidate will have an equal chance to provide information about himself/herself. The structured interview should also allow for flexibility to ask follow-up questions.

There is a standard interview form, Form 3282, available for use. You may wish to use it as the basis for the interview, adding appropriate job-related questions.

The interview should be documented and may be retained in the promotion file maintained by the personnel office. When preparing your documentation, you should keep in mind that the record of the interview may be shared with the employee in the same manner as a performance appraisal.

Following are some items to keep in mind:

- The question tends to influence the response. Ask open ended questions beginning with "why," "how," "what," etc., to allow the candidate to freely express himself/herself.

- Avoid lapsing into agency jargon, abbreviations, acronyms, etc., unless you are sure the interviewee will understand you.

- Conduct the interview in a private setting with no interruptions.

- Be natural and friendly, while maintaining a business-like atmosphere.

- Control the interview to ensure that all important areas are covered.

- Avoid questions that will elicit yes or no answers unless you have planned follow-up questions.

- Avoid questions that can be construed as discriminatory, e.g., if the position requires travel, don't dwell on the effect the travel will have on the individual's home life.

- Avoid making judgments before the interview has been concluded. Don't let your first impression dictate the remainder of the interview.

- Remember, the interview is only a part of the total process and should be viewed as another source of information regarding the individual's ability to meet the specified KSAO's or critical elements.

APPRAISALS OF POTENTIAL AND EMPLOYEE QUESTIONNAIRES

There are three types of potential appraisals. All require that the rater prepare a narrative outlining the candidate's attributes for the position being filled.

Form 4238, Report of Potential for Advancement, may be used for non-managerial positions. It contains questions that the rater must respond to narratively, considering the requirements for successful performance in the position being filled.

Form 6568, Report of Managerial Potential, is usually used for positions covered by the management careers program. The evaluator is required to rate and describe the candidate's potential on each of six standard criteria. It also contains an overall rating scale and other job-related questions to which the rater must respond.

Narratives of potential are prepared by the manager and may be used instead of the above-mentioned forms. At a minimum, the narrative should address the evaluative criteria for the vacancy that are not reflected on the performance appraisal.

Appraisals of potential are usually more judgmental and predictive in nature. Therefore, care should be exercised in using them in the rating and ranking process. An employee's potential may be demonstrated through a variety or combination of ways. These include: successful performance in training courses; successful job performance; special details and assignments; temporary promotions.

Again, it is important that you keep in mind that this is only one of the tools you have available for rating a candidate's potential.

Another useful tool is the employee questionnaire. The questionnaire is usually structured around the KSAO's or critical elements of the vacancy. It requests the applicant to describe in his/her own words, the knowledges, skills, etc., that he/she possesses relative to the position being filled. It provides applicants the opportunity to give their input into the process and address experience, both in-Service and out, that we are unaware of. If a questionnaire is used, it must be so stated in the vacancy announcement. Also, to ensure consistent application of this evaluative method, questionnaires must be secured from all applicants.

THE SELECTION

Once ranking has been completed and best-qualified candidates have been identified, you are ready to make your selection(s). The best-qualified candidates are listed alphabetically on part II of the promotion certificate. At this stage, all best-qualified candidates are considered to be equal and suitable candidates to perform the duties of the vacant position.

The selecting official may chose to interview the best-qualified candidates prior to making a decision, or he/she may wish to designate a panel to conduct the "selection" interview. Whichever is decided, the guidance contained in the section on interviewing should be used. The selecting official may opt to be part of this panel. In the event that he/she is not, upon conclusion of the interviews, the panel will make a recommendation for selection. The selecting official may then review the performance appraisals, ranking documentation, any interview notes, etc., to assist in arriving at the decision.

Once the selection is decided upon, the selectee(s) name(s) should be recorded in the space provided on the promotion certificate. The selecting official must then sign and date the form.

For bargaining unit positions -- If the selectee is to receive a promotion, the promotion must be made effective no later than 1 complete pay period following selection. The only exception to this rule would be if you were making advance selections for attrition/expansion hiring with a specific entrance-on-duty date. In this situation, the announcement must clearly specify that the selectee(s) will be promoted in the first pay period following the date you are authorized to bring employees on board.

The same applies to non-bargaining unit selections. However, the selectees promotion will under no circumstances be delayed beyond two full pay periods, unless the employee agrees to the delay.

Exhibit 1

Positions at the Full Performance Level or Below

Tax Auditor, GS-5/9

Applicant's Name	Position	Organizational Location	Date
Martha Washington	Examination Aide	Examination Division Any District	5/1/86

Instructions:

1. This table will be completed for each eligible applicant and made a permanent part of the promotion file.
2. Add the numerical ratings for each CRITICAL ELEMENT on Form 6850 together, divide the total by the number of critical elements to determine the average rating, and multiply the result by 5 (A below).
3. The ranking panel/official will determine the score (5 to 1) to be assigned to each CRITICAL ELEMENT of the POSITION TO BE FILLED. Compute the overall average rating, and multiply the result by 5 (B below).
4. Add one point (up to a maximum of three (3) points) for each High Quality Step Increase, Sustained Superior Performance Award or performance related Special Act Award (where cash was granted) received by the applicant in the last three years (C below).
5. Add A, B, and C below to determine the applicant's total score (D below).
6. Calculate all numbers in A, B, and D below to the nearest two decimal places.
7. The ranking panel or the ranking official will prepare one written narrative or statement for each critical element for each applicant considered. If the immediate supervisor of any applicant is a member of the ranking panel, then each member will prepare separate narratives for that applicant.
8. Any general questions used in the interview process will be recorded and kept in the file.

PART A. Performance Evaluation, Form 6850

	Critical Element	Rating		Critical Element	Rating
1.	Research/Extraction of Information	4	7.		
2.	Preparation of Schedule/Workpapers	4	8.		
3.	Computation/Tabulation	4	9.		
4.	Case Related Duties	4	10.		
5.	Taxpayer Relations	5	11.		
6.			12.		

Ratings Total: 21 ÷ No. of CEs = Average Rating: 4.20

Average Rating: 4.20 X5 = 21.00 Score A

Part B. Critical Elements of Position to be Filled

		Panel Member #1 (Ranking Official)	Panel Member #2	Panel Member #3
1.	Inventory Management	4	4	4
2.	Examination Techniques	4	3	4
3.	Tax Law Interpretation/Application	4	5	4
4.	Preparation of Workpapers/Reports	4	4	4
5.	Taxpayer Relations	5	4	5
6.				
7.				
	Total:	21	20	21

For Ranking Official:

Total Column #1: _____ ÷ No. of CEs = Average Rating: _____; Average Rating: _____ X5 = [ ] Score B

For Ranking Panel:

Total Columns #1, 2, 3: 62 ÷ [No. of CEsX3] = Average Rating: 4.13; Average Rating: 4.13 X5 = [20.65] Score B

Part C. Awards

	Awards Received	Points (Max. 3)
1.	HQI-1986	1
2.	Special Achievement - 1985	1
3.		

[2] Score C

Part D.

Score A	21.00
Score B	20.65
Score C	2.00

Total Score [43.65]

Signatures:

Ranking Official or Panel Member #1 Group Manager

Panel Member #2 Group Manager

Panel Member #3 Group Manager

PART B SCORE FOR RANKING OFFICIALS
NORD - POSITIONS AT THE FULL PERFORMANCE LEVEL OR BELOW

TS	No. of Critical Elements 7	6	5	4	3	2	1
35	25.00						
34	24.30						
33	23.55						
32	22.85						
31	22.15						
30	21.45	25.00					
29	20.70	24.15					
28	20.00	23.35					
27	19.30	22.50					
26	18.55	21.65					
25	17.85	20.85	25.00				
24	17.15	20.00	24.00				
23	16.45	19.15	23.00				
22	15.70	18.35	22.00				
21	15.00	17.50	21.00				
20	14.30	16.65	20.00	25.00			
19	13.55	15.85	19.00	23.75			
18	12.85	15.00	18.00	22.50			
17	12.15	14.15	17.00	21.25			
16	11.45	13.35	16.00	20.00			
15	10.70	12.50	15.00	18.75	25.00		
14	10.00	11.65	14.00	17.50	23.35		
13	9.30	10.85	13.00	16.25	21.65		
12	8.55	10.00	12.00	15.00	20.00		
11	7.85	9.15	11.00	13.75	18.35		
10	7.15	8.35	10.00	12.50	16.65	25.00	
9	6.45	7.50	9.00	11.25	15.00	22.50	
8	5.70	6.65	8.00	10.00	13.35	20.00	
7	5.00	5.85	7.00	8.75	11.65	17.50	
6		5.00	6.00	7.50	10.00	15.00	
5			5.00	6.25	8.35	12.50	25.00
4				5.00	6.65	10.00	20.00
3					5.00	7.50	15.00
2						5.00	10.00
1							5.00

Note: Locate the total score under the TS column and obtain the Part B Score by identifying the corresponding number of critical elements of the vacant position. Example: TS = 13, 4 critical elements - Part B Score = 16.25.

TS = Total of Column 1.

Exhibit 3

PART B SCORE FOR RANKING PANELS
NORD - POSITIONS AT THE FULL PERFORMANCE LEVEL OR BELOW

No. of Critical Elements

	7	6		7	6	5	4		7	6	5	4	3	2		5	4	3	2	1
TS			TS					TS							TS					
105	25.00		75	17.85	20.85	25.00		45	10.70	12.50	15.00	18.75	25.00		15	5.00	6.25	8.35	12.50	25.00
104	24.74		74	17.60	20.55	24.65		44	10.45	12.20	14.65	18.35	24.45		14		5.85	7.80	11.65	23.35
103	24.50		73	17.40	20.25	24.35		43	10.25	11.95	14.35	17.90	23.90		13		5.40	7.20	10.85	21.65
102	24.30		72	17.15	20.00	24.00		42	10.00	11.65	14.00	17.50	23.35		12		5.00	6.65	10.00	20.00
101	24.05		71	16.90	19.70	23.65		41	9.75	11.40	13.65	17.10	22.80		11			6.10	9.15	18.35
100	23.80		70	16.65	19.45	23.35		40	9.50	11.10	13.35	16.65	22.20		10			5.55	8.35	16.65
99	23.55		69	16.45	19.15	23.00		39	9.30	10.85	13.00	16.25	21.65		9			5.00	7.50	15.00
98	23.35		68	16.20	18.90	22.65		38	9.05	10.55	12.65	15.85	21.10		8				6.65	13.35
97	23.10		67	15.95	18.60	22.35		37	8.80	10.30	12.35	15.40	20.55		7				5.85	11.65
96	22.85		66	15.70	18.35	22.00		36	8.55	10.00	12.00	15.00	20.00		6				5.00	10.00
95	22.60		65	15.45	18.05	21.65		35	8.35	9.70	11.65	14.60	19.45		5					8.35
94	22.40		64	15.25	17.80	21.35		34	8.10	9.45	11.35	14.15	18.90		4					6.65
93	22.15		63	15.00	17.50	21.00		33	7.85	9.15	11.00	13.75	18.35		3					5.00
92	21.90		62	14.75	17.20	20.65		32	7.60	8.90	10.65	13.35	17.80							
91	21.65		61	14.50	16.95	20.35		31	7.40	8.60	10.35	12.90	17.20							
90	21.45	25.00	60	14.30	16.65	20.00	25.00	30	7.15	8.35	10.00	12.50	16.65	25.00						
89	21.20	24.70	59	14.05	16.40	19.65	24.60	29	6.90	8.05	9.65	12.10	16.10	24.15						
88	20.95	24.45	58	13.80	16.10	19.35	24.15	28	6.65	7.80	9.35	11.65	15.55	23.35						
87	20.70	24.15	57	13.55	15.85	19.00	23.75	27	6.45	7.50	9.00	11.25	15.00	22.50						
86	20.45	23.90	56	13.35	15.55	18.65	23.35	26	6.20	7.20	8.65	10.85	14.45	21.65						
85	20.25	23.60	55	13.10	15.30	18.35	22.90	25	5.95	6.95	8.35	10.40	13.90	20.85						
84	20.00	23.35	54	12.85	15.00	18.00	22.50	24	5.70	6.65	8.00	10.00	13.35	20.00						
83	19.75	23.05	53	12.60	14.70	17.65	22.10	23	5.45	6.40	7.65	9.60	12.80	19.15						
82	19.50	22.80	52	12.40	14.45	17.35	21.65	22	5.25	6.10	7.35	9.15	12.20	18.35						
81	19.30	22.50	51	12.15	14.15	17.00	21.25	21	5.00	5.85	7.00	8.75	11.65	17.50						
80	19.05	22.20	50	11.90	13.90	16.65	20.85	20		5.55	6.65	8.35	11.10	16.65						
79	18.80	21.95	49	11.65	13.60	16.35	20.40	19		5.30	6.35	7.90	10.55	15.85						
78	18.55	21.65	48	11.45	13.35	16.00	20.00	18		5.00	6.00	7.50	10.00	15.00						
77	18.35	21.40	47	11.20	13.05	15.65	19.60	17			5.65	7.10	9.45	14.15						
76	18.10	21.10	46	10.95	12.80	15.35	19.15	16			5.35	6.65	8.90	13.35						

TS = Total of Columns 1, 2, and 3 in Part B.

Note: Locate the total score under the TS column and obtain the Part B Score by identifying the corresponding number of critical elements of the vacant position. Example: TS = 55, 5 critical elements - Part B Score = 18.35.

PART B SCORE FOR RANKING OFFICIALS
NORD - POSITIONS ABOVE THE FULL PERFORMANCE LEVEL
NCA - POSITIONS AT GS-8 AND ABOVE

TS	No. of Critical Elements						
	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
35	20.00						
34	19.44						
33	18.84						
32	18.28						
31	17.72						
30	17.16	20.00					
29	16.56	19.32					
28	16.00	18.68					
27	15.44	18.00					
26	14.84	17.32					
25	14.28	16.68	20.00				
24	13.72	16.00	19.20				
23	13.16	15.32	18.40				
22	12.56	14.68	17.60				
21	12.00	14.00	16.80				
20	11.44	13.32	16.00	20.00			
19	10.84	12.68	15.20	19.00			
18	10.28	12.00	14.40	18.00			
17	9.72	11.32	13.60	17.00			
16	9.16	10.68	12.80	16.00			
15	8.56	10.00	12.00	15.00	20.00		
14	8.00	9.32	11.20	14.00	18.68		
13	7.44	8.68	10.40	13.00	17.32		
12	6.84	8.00	9.60	12.00	16.00		
11	6.28	7.32	8.80	11.00	14.68		
10	5.72	6.68	8.00	10.00	13.22	20.00	
9	5.16	6.00	7.20	9.00	12.00	18.00	
8	4.56	5.32	6.40	8.00	10.68	16.00	
7	4.00	4.68	5.60	7.00	9.32	14.00	
6		4.00	4.80	6.00	8.00	12.00	
5			4 00	5.00	6.68	10.00	20.00
4				4.00	5.32	8.00	16.00
3					4.00	6.00	12.00
2						4.00	8.00
1							4.00

Note: Locate the total score under the TS column and obtain the Part B Score by identifying the corresponding number of critical elements of the vacant position. Example: TS = 13, 4 critical elements - Part B Score = 13.00.

TS = Total of Column 1.

Exhibit 5

PART B SCORE FOR RANKING PANELS
NORD - POSITIONS ABOVE THE FULL PERFORMANCE LEVEL
NCA - POSITIONS AT GS-8 AND ABOVE

No. of Critical Elements

	7	6		7	6	5	4		7	6	5	4	3	2		5	4	3	2	1
TS			TS					TS							TS					
105	20.00		75	14.28	16.68	20.00		45	8.56	10.00	12.00	15.00	20.00		15	4.00	5.00	6.68	10.00	20.00
104	19.80		74	14.08	16.44	19.72		44	8.36	9.76	11.72	14.68	19.56		14		4.68	6.24	9.32	18.68
103	19.60		73	13.92	16.24	19.48		43	8.20	9.56	11.48	14.32	19.12		13		4.32	5.76	8.68	17.32
102	19.44		72	13.72	16.00	19.20		42	8.00	9.32	11.20	14.00	18.68		12		4.00	5.32	8.00	16.00
101	19.24		71	13.52	15.76	18.92		41	7.80	9.12	10.92	13.68	18.24		11			4.88	7.32	14.68
100	19.04		70	13.32	15.56	18.68		40	7.60	8.88	10.68	13.32	17.76		10			4.44	6.68	13.32
99	18.84		69	13.16	15.32	18.40		39	7.44	8.68	10.40	13.00	17.32		9			4.00	6.00	12.00
98	18.68		68	12.96	15.12	18.12		38	7.24	8.44	10.12	12.68	16.88		8				5.32	10.68
97	18.48		67	12.76	14.88	17.88		37	7.04	8.24	9.88	12.32	16.44		7				4.68	9.32
96	18.28		66	12.56	14.68	17.60		36	6.84	8.00	9.60	12.00	16.00		6				4.00	8.00
95	18.08		65	12.36	14.44	17.32		35	6.68	7.76	9.32	11.68	15.56		5					6.68
94	17.92		64	12.20	14.24	17.08		34	6.48	7.56	9.08	11.32	15.12		4					5.32
93	17.72		63	12.00	14.00	16.80		33	6.28	7.32	8.80	11.00	14.68		3					4.00
92	17.52		62	11.80	13.76	16.52		32	6.08	7.12	8.52	10.68	14.24							
91	17.32		61	11.60	13.56	16.28		31	5.92	6.88	8.28	10.32	13.76							
90	17.16	20.00	60	11.44	13.32	16.00	20.00	30	5.72	6.68	8.00	10.00	13.32	20.00						
89	16.96	19.76	59	11.24	13.12	15.72	19.68	29	5.52	6.44	7.72	9.68	12.88	19.32						
88	16.76	19.56	58	11.04	12.88	15.48	19.32	28	5.32	6.24	7.48	9.32	12.44	18.68						
87	16.56	19.32	57	10.84	12.68	15.20	19.00	27	5.16	6.00	7.20	9.00	12.00	18.00						
86	16.36	19.12	56	10.68	12.44	14.92	18.68	26	4.96	5.76	6.92	8.68	11.56	17.32						
85	16.20	18.88	55	10.48	12.24	14.68	18.32	25	4.76	5.56	6.68	8.32	11.12	16.68						
84	16.00	18.68	54	10.28	12.00	14.40	18.00	24	4.56	5.32	6.40	8.00	10.68	16.00						
83	15.80	18.44	53	10.08	11.76	14.12	17.68	23	4.36	5.12	6.12	7.68	10.24	15.32						
82	15.60	18.24	52	9.92	11.56	13.88	17.32	22	4.20	4.88	5.88	7.32	9.76	14.68						
81	15.44	18.00	51	9.72	11.32	13.60	17.00	21	4.00	4.68	5.60	7.00	9.32	14.00						
80	15.24	17.76	50	9.52	11.12	13.32	16.68	20		4.44	5.32	6.68	8.88	13.32						
79	15.04	17.56	49	9.32	10.88	13.08	16.32	19		4.24	5.08	6.23	8.44	12.68						
78	14.84	17.32	48	9.16	10.68	12.80	16.00	18		4.00	4.80	6.00	8.00	12.00						
77	14.68	17.12	47	8.96	10.44	12.52	15.68	17			4.52	5.68	7.56	11.32						
76	14.48	16.88	46	8.76	10.24	12.28	15.32	16			4.28	5.32	7.12	10.68						

TS = Total of Columns 1, 2 and 3 in Part B.

Note: Locate the total score under the TS column and obtain the Part B Score by identifying the corresponding number of critical elements of the vacant position. Example: TS = 55, 5 critical elements - Part B Score = 14.68.

Exhibit 6

ROSTER OF ELIGIBLES FOR PROMOTION AND PROMOTION CERTIFICATE

DATE	CERTIFICATE NO.
5/1/86	85-50

POSITION(S) TO BE FILLED	POSITION TITLE	NO. OF VACANCIES	GRADE	SERIES
	Tax Auditor	1	5/7/9	526

ORGANIZATION DESIGNATION AND GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION
Group 102, Branch I
Examination Division - Any District - POD: City, State

QUALIFICATION STANDARD	SELECTIVE PLACEMENT FACTORS USED	METHODS OF LOCATING CANDIDATES
X-118 ☐ SAQS ☐	☐ YES ☒ NO *If "yes," attach justification and listing of factors*	Vacancy Announcement 85-50

PART I – ROSTER OF ELIGIBLES

The following candidates meet basic eligibility requirements for the above cited position(s) and are to be evaluated based upon the criteria and methods specified below. All candidates determined to be highly qualified are to be identified with an asterisk(*).

ELIGIBLE CANDIDATES' NAMES	PRESENT POSITION TITLE AND GRADE	ORGANIZATIONAL DESIGNATION
*Adams, John	Examination Aide, GS-5	Any District
Jackson, Andrew	Examination Aide, GS-5	Any District
*Jefferson, Thomas	Examination Aide, GS-5	Any District
Lincoln, Mary T.	Examination Aide, GS-5	Any District
*Madison, Dolly	Examination Aide, GS-5	Any District
Monroe, James	Examination Aide, GS-5	Any District
Van Buren, Martin	Examination Aide, GS-5	Any District
*Washington, Martha	Examination Aide, GS-5	Any District

CRITERIA FOR DETERMINING "HIGHLY QUALIFIED" AND "BEST QUALIFIED"
(Please list or attach criteria, or cite appropriate reference.)

HQ - Critical Elements, Tax Auditor - Cutoff Score - 35

BQ - Top 4 scores, plus one for each additional vacancy (if appropriate), plus ties (if appropriate).

Evaluation methods to be used in determining Highly Qualified and Best Qualified.
"X" in appropriate blocks(s)

	Mandatory:
X	Performance Appraisal
X	Awards and HQIs
	Mandatory For Some Positions:
	Assessment of Potential *(Managerial Positions Only)*
	Written Tests *(See IRM 0335.5 Specify)*
	Optional *(use only if specified in vacancy announcement)*:
	Assessment of Potential *(Non-Managerial Positions)*
X	Training & Experience
	Interview
	Other *(Specify)*

PART II – PROMOTION CERTIFICATE

The knowledges, skills, abilities and other characteristics (KSAOs) of all "Highly Qualified" candidates listed on the Roster of Eligibles have been carefully evaluated and the following candidates have been determined to be "Best Qualified."

Adams, John
Jefferson, Thomas
Madison, Dolly
Washington, Martha

	SIGNATURE	TITLE	DATE
EVALUATION PANEL OR RANKING OFFICIAL	Group Manager		
	Group Manager		
	Group Manager		
NON-VOTING MEMBER	Personnel Specialist	Personnel Specialist	

THE FOLLOWING CANDIDATES HAVE APPLIED FOR REASSIGNMENT/TRANSFER/REINSTATEMENT, AND MAY BE SELECTED FOR THE POSITION(S) NON-COMPETITIVELY. IF ANY OF THESE ELIGIBLES ARE REQUIRED TO COMPETE, PLACE THEIR NAMES IN PART I WITH OTHER CANDIDATES–DO NOT USE THIS SPACE.

I have selected the following named person(s):	SELECTION DATE	EFFECTIVE DATE (OPTIONAL)
Martha Washington	5-12-85	next pay period

	SIGNATURE(S)	TITLE(S)
SELECTING OFFICIAL(S)	Selecting Official	Chief, Examination Division

GPO 915-194

Form 4537 (Rev. 5-85)

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1986 – 643-857/1022